

REMARKS

Claims 39, 47-51, 57-59, and 67-81 remain in this application. Claims 33-38, 40-46, 52-56, and 60-66 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 39, 47, 49-51, 57-59, and 67-69 have been amended. Claims 70-81 have been added. The amended and added claims are supported by the specification and no new matter has been added. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection – Ellis

The Examiner has rejected claims 33, 37, 40, 46 and 66 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,191,713 issued to Ellis et al. Claims 33, 37, 40, 46 and 66 have been cancelled herein without prejudice to their subsequent reinstatement.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Ellis in view of Allegedly Admitted Prior Art

The Examiner has rejected claims 35, 36, 42, 43, 49, 52, 54, 55, 58, 62, 64 and 68 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,191,713 issued to Ellis et al. in view of allegedly admitted prior art. Claims 35, 36, 42, 43, 49, 52, 54, 55, 58, 62, 64 and 68 have been cancelled herein without prejudice to their subsequent reinstatement.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Ellis in view of Allegedly Admitted Prior Art and Olarig

The Examiner has rejected claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,191,713 issued to Ellis et al. in view of allegedly admitted prior art and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,524 issued to Olarig et al.

(“Olarig”). Claim 59 has been cancelled herein without prejudice to its subsequent reinstatement.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Ellis in view of Popat

The Examiner has rejected claims 38, 44, 56 and 61 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,191,713 issued to Ellis et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,564,114 issued to Popat et al. Claims 38, 44, 56 and 61 have been cancelled herein without prejudice to their subsequent reinstatement.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has objected to claims 34, 39, 41, 45 47, 48, 50, 51, 53, 57, 60, 63, 65, 67 and 69 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and has indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful examination and for finding allowable subject matter. Claims 39, 47, 50, 51, 57, 67, and 69 have been rewritten as indicated. Claims 48, 49, 58-59, and 68, and 70-81 depend on one or more of these claims, and are also believed to be allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed at the earliest possible date.

Request For Telephone Interview

The Examiner is invited to call Brent E. Vecchia at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request For An Extension Of Time

The Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 for such an extension.

Charge Our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 9-2-04



Brent E. Vecchia
Reg. No. 48,011

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980